

DTIC FILE COPY

②

STUDY PROJECT

The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Defense or any of its agencies. This document may not be released for open publication until it has been cleared by the appropriate military service or government agency.

AD-A220 575

THE MISSING LINK--MANPOWER STAFFING STANDARDS AND THE BUDGET PROCESS

BY

LARRY V. MCKENZIE, DAC

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A: Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

DTIC
ELECTE
APR 18 1990
S B D

2 APRIL 1990



U.S. ARMY WAR COLLEGE, CARLISLE BARRACKS, PA 17013-5050

1. 002

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) The Missing Link--Manpower Staffing Standards and the Budget Process		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Study Project
7. AUTHOR(s) Mr. Larry V. McKenzie		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS U.S. Army War College Carlisle Barracks, PA 17013-5050		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s)
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS Same		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)		12. REPORT DATE April 1986
		13. NUMBER OF PAGES 34
		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified
		15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.		
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)		
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) The Manpower Staffing Standards System (MS-3) is a relatively new program now being used in the Army to determine manpower requirements for TDA organizations. There is some controversy concerning the use of standards and their role relative to the Army's Planning, Programming, Budgeting, and Execution System (PPBES). This study was initiated based on a topic submitted by Forces Command which posed questions about the validity of the standards and their (the standards) role in the PPBES. The study describes the background of the new system and provides answers to the questions, plus makes some (continued on back)		

DD FORM 1 JAN 73 1473 EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE

UNCLASSIFIED
SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Data Entered)

recommendations concerning improvement of the link between the MS-3 Program and the PPBES.

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Data Entered)

UNCLASSIFIED

USAWC MILITARY STUDIES PROGRAM PAPER

The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Defense or any of its agencies. This document may not be released for open publication until it has been cleared by the appropriate military service or government agency.

THE MISSING LINK--MANPOWER STAFFING STANDARDS
AND THE BUDGET PROCESS

AN INDIVIDUAL STUDY PROJECT

by

LARRY V. MCKENZIE, DAC

COLONEL DANNY L. CRAWFORD
Project Adviser

**DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A: Approved for public
release; distribution is unlimited.**

U.S. Army War College
Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania 17013
2 April 1990

UNCLASSIFIED

ABSTRACT

AUTHOR: Larry V. McKenzie, DAC

TITLE: The Missing Link--Manpower Staffing Standards System and the Budget Process

FORMAT: Individual Study Project

DATE: 2 April 1990 PAGES: 31 CLASSIFICATION: UNCLASSIFIED

The Manpower Staffing Standards System (MS-3) is a relatively new program now being used in the Army to determine manpower requirements for TDA organizations. There is some controversy concerning the use of standards and their role relative to the Army's Planning Programming Budgeting and Execution System (PPBES). This study was initiated based on a topic submitted by Forces Command which posed questions about the validity of the standards and their (the standards) role in the PPBES. The study describes the background of the new system and provides answers to the questions, plus makes some recommendations concerning improvement of the link between the MS-3 Program and the PPBES.



Accession For	
NTIS GRA&I	<input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/>
DTIC TAB	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unannounced	<input type="checkbox"/>
Justification	
By _____	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or Special
A-1	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT.....	ii
CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. MS-3 DEFINED.....	3
III. WHY STANDARDS?.....	9
IV. HOW VALID ARE MANPOWER STANDARDS.....	13
V. THE CURRENT ROLE OF STANDARDS.....	16
VI. A BETTER LINK TO THE PPBES.....	24
VII. CONCLUSIONS.....	27
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	30

THE MISSING LINK--MANPOWER STAFFING STANDARDS AND THE BUDGET PROCESS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The military machine- the army
and everything related to it-is basically
very simple and therefore seems easy to manage.
But we should bear in mind that none of its components
is of one piece: each part is composed of
individuals, every one of whom retains his
potential of friction.

-Clausewitz¹

It is doubtful that Clausewitz had the efficiency of today's Army in mind when he wrote those words. They are, however, applicable to the every day decisions which every commander and senior leader must make in the operation of our very complex Army. Almost all decisions represent the competition of interests within the Army. Each set of circumstances surrounding a decision has the potential to create friction which can inhibit the accomplishment of missions and can cost the Army and the taxpayer more than necessary.

The Manpower Staffing Standard (MS-3) Program was instituted Army-wide to provide some help in making manpower decisions. The concept being to provide commanders and senior leaders the framework to comfortably quantify the ingredients in manpower decisions. MS-3 enables the commander/executive to make decisions which not only conform to an Army norm, but also have some basis in reason and statistics. The result is to reduce friction and to allow for manpower resources to be applied as efficiently as possible.

It is my purpose in this study to examine the basis of the MS-3 Program as it was conceived and as it functions today. I also intend to review the environment in which it was created and assess its progress toward stated objectives. I will review the logic for having such a program and examine its applicability to the Army.

Lastly, I will explore the question submitted by FORSCOM relevant to the connection the MS-3 Program has with the Planning Programming Budgeting and Execution System (PPBES). With the integrated views of Army personnel who are concerned with that interface, I will recommend improvements for that linkage which, in my opinion, will enhance the utility of the MS-3 Program.

END NOTES

1. Carl Von Clausewitz, On War, Book one, p. 119.

CHAPTER II

MS-3 DEFINED

As the Competition for scarce resources intensifies, many "battles" are being fought in the peacetime military.

-Larry McKenzie¹

In the peace time military, most of the "battles" that are fought, are fought over resources. Indeed the battle of the buck is a major preoccupation of senior leaders at almost every level of command. A major portion of those deliberations is the allocation of manpower, or manpower shortage. Manpower decisions land on the commander's desk for resolution on a fairly frequent basis. As part of the decision process, the parochial interests of different competing factions of the command are considered.

How do we expect the commander to make these decisions? He certainly cannot be an expert in the staffing needs of every portion of his command. His intuition is certainly good, but he really needs some quantitative help to make these types of decisions. His counterparts in the private sector certainly use standards in similar circumstances. MS-3 standards provide him a quantitative tool to use to allocate manpower spaces, or manpower space shortage.

The primary function of the MS-3 Program is to determine the

manpower needs of organizations which support the combat Army. These organizations are primarily installations which provide housekeeping and morale support for our soldiers, and are predominantly staffed with civilian employees.

MS-3 standards are part of the overall Force Integration concept as it applies to the portion of the Army documented in Tables of Distribution and Allowances (TDA). Manpower standards are analogous to the Force Development and Combat Development disciplines used to develop the combat and combat support forces documented in Tables of Organization and Equipment (TOE).

A MS-3 standard is essentially an algebraic equation which when solved provides a recommended staffing level in terms of manpower requirements. The variable part of the equation is the workload over a given amount of time which when supplied and solved for the unknown yields the staffing level. The following is a direct quote from AR 570-5: Manpower Staffing Standard System, providing the official definition of a MS-3 Standard.

A manpower staffing standard is an expression of the quantitative and qualitative manpower requirements for the performance of a given set of functionally homogeneous tasks at varying levels of workload. It is normally stated both as a mathematical equation relating required man-hours to workload factors, and in tabular format showing numbers and skills of people required for a range of incremental workload factor values. Manpower staffing standards are usually developed at the work center level of functional activity.²

A simplified example of how a manpower standard is applied for an aircraft maintenance function is as follows:

$$X = 1008 + .08504(2000)$$

Where:

1008 = Fixed costs (in manhours) of having a maintenance function ready to go to work.

.08504 = The standard (developed usually by work sampling or time study with scientific on-site measurements and a great deal of analysis not only by manpower analysts but also by functional experts from either Department of the Army or the Major Command)

2000 = Programmed flying hours per month

Solving for X results in 1178.08 man-hours per month.

Man-hours are then divided by a monthly availability factor of 145.

145 = The average number of available hours for productive work in a month. This number results from subtracting officially sanctioned absences from work such as leave, union duties, or training, such as SAEDA or code of conduct, from total available hours. (A more complete explanation is provided in Chapter V on page 16.)

$$1008 + .08504(2000) = 1178.08/145 = 8.125 \text{ or } 8 \text{ Manpower Requirements}$$

As indicated in the above definition, MS-3 standards are normally developed at the work center level of activity. Great pains are taken to develop standards that have utility on an Army-wide basis. In the case of the above example, this same standard would be equally applicable at all Army posts having an aircraft maintenance function. The only difference in the application of the standard would be the work load level which would result in different staffing at each installation for the same type of work.

The Army's efforts to develop a standard installation organization and to standardize TDA organizations within Major Army Commands (MACOM) have made this type of Army-wide system possible. Obviously, when this type of uniform organization does not exist, then manpower standards with a lesser scope of applicability are developed. They can range from standards applicable at only one place, called single point standards, to standards applicable at all similar activities in a MACOM, called MACOM standards, to Army-wide standards. Functions where hours and outputs are difficult to define, such as the commanders job, are not candidates for standards development. Where this exists and where it is not economically reasonable to justify the development effort, standards are not created.

MS-3 standards are categorized into two types. Type I is a standard characterized by a full scale onsite study using industrial engineering techniques such as work sampling or time study. Type II is a standard developed with existing statistical data, and is less rigorous in terms of statistical criteria which must be met.

MS-3 Standards are a relatively recent phenomenon in the development of Army TDA manpower requirements. And, they represent a vast improvement over the old Manpower Survey Program used since World War II. The Manpower Survey Program was based on an onsite evaluation by the next higher headquarters. It was decidedly non-scientific and results depended largely on the bargaining abilities of the surveyor and

those being surveyed.

In 1979 the General Accounting Office (GAO) reviewed the Army's Manpower requirements process and found them significantly lacking in statistical validity and recommended the Army develop a workload based manpower standards system such as that used by the Air Force.² The Army's Deputy Chief of Staff, Personnel (DCSPER) then began to develop the system called for by the GAO. The first effort in this regard was an Army Standard for Installation Civilian Personnel Offices.

Since that first standards development effort, the DCSPER has created MS-3 development staffs at each MACOM. An Army Field Operating Agency was created to run the program under the guidance of the Army DCSPER. The Agency, U. S. Army Manpower Requirements and Documentation Agency (USAMARDA), was located at Ft. Belvoir and became operational in late 1983. In 1989 USAMARDA was combined with several other Force Integration related Field Operating Agencies into a new Agency called USAFISA, or U. S. Army Force Integration Support Agency, and is now designated a Field Operating Agency under the Army's Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations (DCSOPS).

The universe of need for MS-3 standards is the Army TDA structure minus those headquarters, and one of a kind TDA activities, which do not lend themselves to logical standards development. This leaves a universe of 502,000 spaces. As of June 1989, 155,813 of these spaces

had been covered by standards. Standards for another 211,000, are now in progress. The work continues, with roughly 700 personnel Army-wide devoted to MS-3 standards development.*

END NOTES

1. Larry V. McKenzie, "Command Mission Guidance", Resource Management Journal, Comptroller of the Army, Spring 1981, p. 28.

2. U.S. Department of the Army, Regulation 570-5, p. 11.

3. Comptroller General of the United States, Lack of Control And Feedback Hinders Army Manpower Management Improvements, p.4.

4. U.S. Army Force Integration Support Agency, Standards Progress Briefing for the DCSOPS, June 1989.

CHAPTER III

WHY STANDARDS?

It will become evident that an eminent commander needs more than experience and a strong will.

-Clausewitz¹

Why has the Army devoted resources to the establishment of Manpower Staffing Standards for its TDA structure? The genesis of this Military Study Project was a topic submitted by U. S. Army Forces Command (FORSCOM), subject: The Missing Link--Manpower Staffing Standards System and the Budget Process.² As sub-ideas under this topic the FORSCOM submission asked four questions:

- What is the intent of the Manpower Staffing Standards System?
- How valid are the standards?
- How well does the Army tie the staffing process to the budget process in presenting budget requests to Congress?
- If we cannot link the two processes, is there still a justification for the staffing standards system?

Having now defined the MS-3 Process, and the relevant questions asked by Forces Command, what follows is an evaluation of the logic for

the use of standards in the Army. In addition, the questions are referenced and specifically answered.

Standards of all types are used everyday in business and industry. Standardization has long been recognized as a basic principle of efficient organizations. Professor Ralph Currier Davis of Ohio State University, and a noted consultant in Industrial Management, says in his book entitled, Fundamentals of Top Management:

Standards are criteria that enable us to relate functions, physical factors, and personnel to objectives by means of policy. They (standards) are necessary for measuring, proportioning, and maintaining business factors, forces, and effects in proper condition and relation to one another.

He further states that "(Standards)...are necessary to evaluate factors, forces, and effects involved. The latter cannot be proportioned and related properly for optimum results without standards."

Professor Davis was talking about business. Do these same ideas and principles apply to government operations and specifically to the Army? The answer, in my opinion, is yes. The only possible difference between them is the lack of a profit motive in the government. In every other aspect of management do we not want to maximize performance and productivity of our TDA organizations? Based on Professor Davis' logic, we would be sub-optimizing our efforts without the use of standards.

Frederick Winslow Taylor, the widely recognized father of scientific management, was an avid advocate of the use of time standards in the work place. In his first book on the subject of scientific management entitled Shop Management, he went into great detail on the benefits of time study and the consequent development of time standards in the work place. He says that the "art" of time study should be undertaken seriously, and looked upon as a profession. He sums up by stating that without the use of time standards the understanding of progress will be slow.*

Marvin E. Mundel, a widely read author on industrial engineering subjects, defines standards as "a numerical coefficient for converting a quantitative statement of the workload to a quantitative statement of the required manpower resources."⁵ It seems obvious that some measure must be used to determine the number of manpower spaces that are needed to accomplish a given function. The most accurate and scientific method of achieving this is through the use of manpower standards. The answer to the first posed question i.e., "What is the intent of the manpower staffing standard system," in light of the above, seems clear. The intent is to provide a scientific and dependable way to determine how many people are needed to do a given job in the TDA structure.

In the Army today a great deal of effort is put into determining the manpower needs of military units which have wartime missions. The

combat developers go into a great deal of study to determine the structure for fighting and supporting units. The Manpower Requirements Criteria (MARC) Program exists solely to determine the staffing needs of combat service support type units. The MS-3 program is the TDA equivalent to that effort. Given this level of effort, it follows that some sort of criteria are needed to determine the manpower needs of the TDA structure.

In an organization as big as the TDA Army, we simply cannot leave the staffing of functions to chance or to the unsupported claims of commanders and managers. Managers in the public sector have the special trust of the taxpayers, and, as such, must ensure that staffing of these functions is minimum essential. The function of determining manpower requirements is a valid ongoing one. Why not do it scientifically, as it is done in the private sector where the profit motive is prevalent? The special trust of the taxpayers should be as powerful a motive in the public sector as making a profit is in the private sector.

END NOTES

1. Clausewitz, p. 121.
2. U.S. Army War College Memorandum, MSP Study Topics, 14 August 1989, p. 26.
3. Ralph Currier Davis, The Fundamentals of Top Management, p. 21-22.
4. Frederick Winslow Taylor, Scientific Management, p. 121.
5. Marvin E. Mundel, Motion and Time Studies, Principles and Practices, 4th Edition, p. 288.

CHAPTER IV

HOW VALID ARE MANPOWER STANDARDS?

Valid (adj). Founded on truth or fact.
-WEBSTER'S II New Riverside Dictionary¹

The second question posed by FORSCOM, i.e., "How valid are the standards?", can be interpreted in two ways. How valid are they statistically, or how valid are they as a process in the overall scheme of resource management? Certainly the easier of the two questions is how valid are they statistically. This can be disposed of rather quickly because AR 570-5 devotes an appendix to quality assurance.² The appendix has an extensive check list devoted to every phase of standards development. It also provides "standards" for the standards in terms of qualitative levels of precision which must be met in order to designate the effort as an Army-wide standard. In addition to this regulatory guidance, USAFISA has a quality assurance organization which rigidly reviews every standards submission at each stage of development to ensure its validity.

The question of validity in the overall scheme of resource management is more difficult and certainly harder to appreciate. Already touched upon was the fact that standards act as a tool for

commanders at local and command levels to make allocation decisions. And, certainly there are other roles that standards development plays in resource management. Among these are contributions to the determination of size and organizational complexity of organizations and the implementation of the standardized organization policy throughout the Army. This is a significant idea when considered in light of the great amount of effort and study put forth to determine the organization, size, and complexity of TOE organizations. It seems logical to also dedicate significant effort to determine the size of the TDA Force.

Peter F. Drucker says that the geometric law of surface and mass applies to organizational size and complexity.

It means that size, structure, and strategy are closely related. Different sizes require different structures, different policies, different strategies, and different behaviors. There are right sizes and wrong sizes for different businesses. The law implies that there is a finite limit to size beyond which an organization declines in productivity and ultimately ceases to be manageable.²

The MS-3 Program, in conjunction with the old Manpower Survey Program, is the only program in the Army devoted to sizing the TDA portion of the Army. It is the only systematic and scientific effort to control its growth and to ensure that the right talent in the right amount is present to get the job done.

The two ideas of quality assurance and sizing the TDA Army are sufficient alone to answer the second FORSCOM question, i.e., "How Valid are the Standards?", the standards themselves are valid. They are subjected to enough rigor to ensure their credibility and applicability to the TDA force. The fact that they are the only tool we have to size the TDA Army is reason enough to justify the existence of the program. In addition, the setting of any Army-wide standard serves as a productivity enhancement. All those functions falling below the standard are at least brought up to standard and staffed accordingly. Undoubtedly, standards give the commander a valid and significant weapon, founded in truth and fact, to use in the battle of resources.

END NOTES

1. WEBSTER'S II New Riverside Dictionary, 1984, p.759.
2. AR 570-5, Appendix F.
3. Peter F. Drucker, Management, Task Responsibilities, Practices, p. 638.

CHAPTER V
THE CURRENT ROLE OF STANDARDS

Generally, management of many is
the same as the management
of the few. It is a matter
of organization.

-Sun Tzu¹

Army Manpower Staffing Standards are developed to determine manpower requirements for the TDA Army and, where possible, replace the manpower survey method which is less scientific and certainly more subjective. But along with the development of staffing standards, many other ancillary products have been developed which are contributing to the efficiency and effectiveness, hence the readiness of the TDA Army. What follows is a list and short definition of some of the major products which have accompanied the advent of the Army MS-3 Program.

-The Army Availability Factor.² The Army Availability Factor is the average number of man-hours per month that an assigned individual is available to perform primary duties, i.e., the duties for which his or her position was created. This differs from paid manhours which is 2,080 hours per year. This factor is needed to convert required manhours into manpower requirements which are in fact man-month equivalents since we figure them on a monthly basis. This may seem

rather mundane but extensive research was necessary to determine this factor since there are many officially sanctioned activities which take the soldier or civilian away from his or her primary duties. Examples of these are code of conduct training, trips to the military personnel office or the civilian personnel office, union meetings, annual leave, and various extra duties. The list of officially sanctioned, paid absences, from the work place is nearly endless. The research was able to capture this information and begin the formulation of an Army-wide policy concerning it. The factor obtained by the research was 145 productive hours per month for both TDA military and civilian of all grades. This is the figure used earlier to demonstrate how manpower standards are applied. Staffing is now based on this factor which normalizes regional and cultural differences around the Army. The result is an assurance to the local commander that staffing for his functions are established upon the same criteria as all other similar functions in the Army.

-The Army Functional Dictionary.² Known simply as the AFD, the Army Functional Dictionary provides a listing of Army TDA functions at work center level. Presently it is grouped into 19 functional categories and arranged hierarchically so that they may be applied at any command level. This first Army Functional Dictionary has each function coded along with its definition. The codes are used to:

-Help in the identification of the universe of spaces for MS-3 studies.

-Identify those work centers covered by standards in The Army Authorization Documents System (TAADS).

-Allow for the verification and monitoring of standards-based manpower requirements and authorizations.

-Facilitate comparative analysis during review of TAA issues.

-Mobilization Base Requirements Model (MOBREM).⁴ Using data from and equations similar to the MS-3 equations, MOBREM is a model which predicts mobilization manpower needs at the Macro level for the Continental United States (CONUS) mobilization base. MOBREM is an excellent programmers model which would not have come into being without the MS-3 program, because data from MS-3 is used to develop the Program Estimating Equations used in the model.

-Base Operating Support Manpower Model (BOSMM).⁵ BOSMM was developed for use as a tool for manpower planners to predict the impact on installation support of moving (in or out) a large Army unit. For example, it accurately predicts the amount of support manpower spaces needed at installation X if a Brigade of Infantry were to be moved there. Here again, this basic research and product have come about as a result of the MS-3 Program.

The MS-3 Program is causing the Army to be more prudent with its manpower and, also, more effective by scientifically determining manpower requirements. Its value, although significant at the Army level, is most important at the local level, because it gives the

commander the quantitative tool he needs to make allocation decisions. FORSCOM's inference that MS-3 is not connected to the PPBES system is fallacious. It is this linkage at the local level which the smart commander can use to his advantage. But, the second part of the question refers to how well the Army ties the staffing process to the budget process and presents its needs to congress. The budgeteers of the Army would like us to think that they are not linked. Their position seems to be that since there is not an MS-3 schedule in the budget, that the standards are not linked to the PPBES. Actually, the value of the MS-3 program is found in its analytical strength and in the contribution it makes in building elements of the Program part as opposed to the Budget part of PPBES.

USAFISA, using the MS-3 Program, accomplishes the manpower analysis of the TDA Total Army Analysis (TAA) issues at Department of the Army Level. Their results are considered by the Council of Colonels (COC) and the General Officer Steering Committee (GOSC) of the TAA process.⁶ Each TAA cycle, hundreds of TAA manpower issues are submitted from around the Army to be considered and prioritized. TAA comprises a major part of the manpower portion of the Army Program. An independent analytical agency is needed to ferret out the relative merit of each issue and put a recommendation before the various bodies that consider them. USAFISA, using MS-3, fills this need. Without this tool the parochial views of the various staffs are all that would be heard.

The use of these tools ensures a more scientific and equitable prioritization of the issues with the Program process of PPBES.

A similar effort is undertaken at many MACOM's to ensure their prioritized list of issues is solidly based and analyzed to ensure the need for manpower resources is valid and competitive. The manpower requirements analysts at the MACOM, or the MACOM equivalent to USAFISA, are the people who conduct these analyses. The methods they use are found in AR 570-5. And, even though many of the issues considered are not covered by standards, many of the MS-3 analytical techniques are used to do the work. The MS-3 Program has provided this capability to the Army which it previously did not have.

Another linkage for the MS-3 Standards to the PPBES is in the local manpower analysis and allocation process used at MACOM and installation level. MS-3 is a technology of sorts which, although widely accepted in the private sector, is relatively new to the Army. This analytical capability enables the smart commander to resolve manpower issues by means other than the "squeaky wheel" technique which has been traditionally used.

Yet another linkage is the connection between resourced authorizations in the TDA and manpower requirements which serve as a bench mark for determining the authorizations. Requirements are determined by MS-3 Standards and they are documented in the requirements

column of the TDA. The authorizations column is then determined. It cannot exceed, the requirements column. The authorizations column is undoubtedly linked to the PPBES process, because it is that column which is resourced in terms of both military and civilian manpower spaces.

The inference that the MS-3 Program is not linked to the PPBES process is simply not true. Its relationship is somewhat indirect, but the relationship is there and it is a strong one. It frankly serves as the analytical base for manpower resource decision making. The results of the program are documented in the TDA and also in budget documents in terms of funded manyears. Without the analytical underpinnings, manpower resource decision making would be done by a "seat of the pants" process like so many budgetary decisions which are not based on serious analytical work before the money is obligated. No doubt many budgeteers would prefer abolition of the MS-3 program as it would bring them additional clout in the resource management realm.

The currently popular idea that the Manage the Civilian work force to Budget (MCB) initiative eliminates the need for a strong MS-3 Program is misguided.⁷ The budgeteers position is that available dollars alone will determine the number of civilians needed. How will the decisions be made? Without some strong analytical work, the commander will be hard pressed to make informed decisions. The fact that the same industrial engineering techniques, as are embodied in the MS-3 Program, are used in the private sector ought to give us a clue as to the proper

role of manpower standards, because in the private sector manpower resources are also subject to dollar constraints. The belief that large corporations use nothing but dollar availability to determine their manpower needs is specious. Small businesses may operate that way, but not multimillion dollar corporations to which the Army certainly compares.

Lastly, history has proven that commanders and managers are unable to trim manpower "fat" on their own. We seem to equate success with those managers who are able to build their empires. This results in an uneven application of Army manpower resources which leads to uneven mission accomplishment and poor service to the soldier. The MS-3 Program provides the means to make the readjustments periodically needed. The basis of these judgements is not the cry of a subordinate commander, but rather a scientific assessment of the workload which is then equated to the needed manpower. The MACOM Commander is better served; the taxpayer is better served, and, most importantly, the soldier is better served.

Congress has been sensitive to the lack of justification for Army staffing requests. The MS-3 Program provides the only tool for providing that justification on a scientific basis as opposed to the best guess of a senior general. The answer to the FORSCOM question of,

"If we cannot link the two processes, is there still justification for the Staffing Standards System?", is an unequivocal, yes. We simply cannot do away with the one analytical manpower tool we have. To do so would be to invite irregularities and massive misallocation of manpower based only on the personality of the subordinate commander or manager involved instead of a scientific assessment of his true manpower needs.

END NOTES

1. Sun Tzu, The Art of War, p. 90.
2. AR 570-5, p. 185.
3. Ibid., p. 11.
4. Jim White, U.S. Army Force Integration Support Agency Off-site Planning Conference, Arlie, Virginia, 6 September, 1989.
5. Ibid.
6. Interview with Stephen Croall, GM-15, U.S. Army Force Integration Support Agency, Ft. Belvoir, Virginia, 7 December, 1989.
7. Department of the Army, Office of the Assistant Secretary, Memorandum, Program and Budget Committee (PBC) Meeting-Managing the Civilian Workforce to Budget (MCB), 28 November 1989.

CHAPTER VI
A BETTER LINK TO THE PPBES

Few things are harder to put up with
than the annoyance of a
good example.

-Mark Twain*

The good example of the MS-3 Program is, as previously discussed, better suited to serve analytically in the Program process as opposed to the Budget process. I do not predict a separate budget schedule for the MS-3 Program. However, it is possible to foresee some policy changes which would better link the analytical strength of the MS-3 Program with the budget process. Some of these policy changes should be:

-Establish an Army-wide policy which says spaces covered with MS-3 Standards would be resourced first. This would not only improve the tie to the PPBES, but it would also ensure that our scarce resources are being spent on our most important functions in the right amounts.

-Establish an Army-wide policy on the use of manpower spaces which are found to be excess when an MS-3 Standard is applied. If local commanders were allowed to keep these spaces and use them in other critical areas, they would be much more supportive of the overall program.

-If an MS-3 verified manpower requirement is not resourced within two years, either from an Armywide resource decision or from internal sources, then scale the workload back to the level the Army leadership has chosen to resource the function. This is based upon the fact that standards provide the requirements necessary to accomplish workload prescribed by the functional proponent in regulations and reporting requirements. If the work is not required by law, and a lower level of effort is acceptable, then the Army should recognize a lower level of effort in both the regulation and in the manpower standard.²

-The Army community and, specifically, commanders, should be taught in their advanced courses that the MS-3 Program is "the" Army Program to viably identify manpower requirements while simultaneously providing a means and source document for justifying additional resources once the standard has been applied and the results verified.

-Establish an Armywide policy which requires the MACOM, when required to apply a standard, to accomplish one or more of the following if there is a shortfall of authorized spaces:

- Determine if the difference can be found internally.

- Submit a request to next higher using the Out of Cycle Process.

- Examine regulations, policies, and procedures to see if changes can be made to require less manpower.

-Examine the technological base to see if automation can substitute for more manpower.

-Submit manpower resource issues through the TAA process to obtain eventual staffing.

END NOTES

1. Mark Twain, Wit and Wisecracks, p. 90.
2. Draft U.S. Army Regulation 570-5, unpublished Chapter 28.

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSION

I am now sending back to Belle Plain
all my wagons for a fresh supply of provisions
and ammunition, and propose to fight it out
on this line if it takes all summer.

-Ulysses S. Grant¹

Based on the research which has gone into the writing of this Military Studies Project, there is no missing link, and the MS-3 Program should not be abandoned. Like General Grant, we must show some determination to continue the standards project we, as a corporate Army, have started. The MS-3 Program contributes to the budget development process in determining needed manpower the same way the number of buildings on a post contributes to the budget for building maintenance.

The relationship of the MS-3 Program to FPBES is a solid one. Based on this premise the FORSCOM questions can be answered succinctly as follows:

(a) What is the intent of the Manpower Staffing Standards System?

The intent is to provide the Army a scientific, quantifiable way of determining its manpower requirements. The budgeteers should applaud this effort as opposed to wanting to abolish it. It does get the job

done that it was designed to do.

(b) How valid are the standards?

Not only are the standards themselves statistically valid, but standards are also a valid concept for management of any enterprise.

(c) How well does the Army tie the staffing process to the budget process in presenting budget requests to Congress?

The Army uses the standards and the techniques associated with standards development in the TAA process in building the Army Program. The Program drives the Budget which is eventually approved by Congress. The GAO directed the Army to establish a standards program so that Congress could have greater confidence in Army staffing requests contained in the Budget.²

(d) If we cannot link the two processes, is there still justification for the Staffing Standards System?

The two processes are linked in the Program part of PPBES. The MS-3 Program is an analytical tool, not a budget process. It certainly supports the budget process but it has many other uses and utility.

The MS-3 Program is a strong analytical tool which should be supported and used by the Resource Management Community as well as the rest of the Army. It is the Army version of scientific management which has proven to be one of the strengths of American enterprise. To operate without it would invite corruption and malutilization of scarce resources which would be a betrayal of the faith of the taxpayers.

END NOTES

1. Bruce Catton, Grant Takes Command, p. 223.
2. Comptroller General of the United States, Lack of Control And Feedback Hinders Army Manpower Management Improvements, p.4.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Clausewitz, Carl Von. On War, Book One, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984.
2. McKenzie, Larry V. "Command Mission Guidance," Resource Management Journal, Washington: Comptroller of the Army, Spring 1981.
3. U.S. Department of the Army. Army Regulation 570-5: Manpower Staffing Standards System, Washington: June 1989.
4. Comptroller General of the United States, Lack of Control and Feedback Hinders Army Manpower Management Improvements, OSD case number 5317, Washington: 31 October, 1979.
5. U.S. Army Force Integration Support Agency. Standards Progress Briefing for the Army DCSOPS, Washington: June 1989.
6. U.S. Army War College Memorandum. MSP Study Topics, 14 August 1989, Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania.
7. Davis, Ralph Currier. The Fundamentals of Top Management. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1951.
8. Taylor, Frederick Winslow. Scientific Management. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1947.
9. Mundel, Marvin E. Motion and Time Studies, Principle and Practices, 4th Edition. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1970.
10. WEBSTER'S II New Riverside Dictionary. Boston: Berkely, 1984. p. 759: "Valid."
11. Drucker, Peter F. Management, Task Responsibilities, Practices. New York: Harper and Row, 1973.
12. Tzu, Sun. The Art of War. Translated by Samuel Griffith, Oxford England: Oxford University Press, 1971.
13. White, Jim. U.S. Army Force Integration Support Agency Off-site Planning Conference. Briefing. Arlie, Virginia: 6 September 1989. (Cited with special permission of Mr. White.)
14. Croall, Stephen. U.S. Army Force Integration Support Agency. Personal Interview. Ft. Belvoir, Virginia: 7 December 1989.

15. U.S. Army Office of the Assistant Secretary Memorandum.
Program and Budget Committee (PBC) meeting-Managing the Civilian
Workforce to Budget (MCB). Washington: 28 November 1989.

16. Twain, Mark. Wit and Wisecracks. White Plains New York:
Peter Pauper Press, 1961.

17. U.S. Department of the Army Draft Regulation. 570-5 Chapter
28. Unpublished, Washington: December 1989.

18. Catton, Bruce. Grant Takes Command. Toronto: Little, Brown
Publishers, 1969.